

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is unclear whether “a gas/water supply pipe-laying system” reads on (1) “a gas supply pipe-laying system or water supply pipe-laying system” or (2) “a gas and water supply pipe-laying system”. Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is unclear whether “an electric power/telephone wiring system” reads on (1) “an electric power wiring system or telephone wiring system” or (2) “an electric power and telephone wiring system”. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 1-10, 12-14 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following claim elements are means (or step) plus function limitations that invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph: Claim 1 – “...means for referencing...”, “...selective display designating means for automatically selecting...”; Claim 12 – “...means ... for selecting...”; Claim 14 – “...first means for referencing...”, “...second means for temporally storing...”; Claim 26 – “...means for referencing...” However, the written description fails to clearly link or associate the disclosed structure, material, or acts to the claimed function

Art Unit: 2628

such that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function.

Applicant is required to: (a) Amend the claim so that the claim limitation will no longer be a means (or step) plus function limitation under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph; or (b) Amend the written description of the specification such that it clearly links or associates the corresponding structure, material, or acts to the claimed function without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)); or (c) State on the record where the corresponding structure, material, or acts are set forth in the written description of the specification that perform the claimed function. For more information, see 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP 2181 and 608.01(o).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 15-18 and 20-25 are allowed. In regard to said claims the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest the respective claim limitations when considered as a whole.

6. Claims 1, 14 and 26 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph set forth in this Office action.

7. Claims 2-10, 12 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph and the respective claim objections set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2628

8. In regard to claims 1-10, 12-14 and 26 the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest the respective claim limitations when considered as a whole.

Goldwasser et al. teaches a real-time 3D display device that includes a plurality of individual processing elements each having an image memory for storing a mini-image of a portion of the object as viewed from any given direction and a merge control means for generating a combined image of the object including the depth thereof by selection on a pixel-by-pixel basis from each of the mini-images.

In two different embodiments, priority codes are assigned to each of the processing elements reflecting the relative significance of a given pixel of the mini-image produced by a given processing element as compared to the pixels of mini-images produced by other processing elements. In one embodiment, the combined image is generated in accordance with the priority codes (Abstract).

However, Goldwasser et al. fails to explicitly teach: a plurality of display time priority levels each having a different display time which is shorter than said total display time; display of each of said sub-drawings (e.g., mini-image) / divided facility drawings can be accomplished within a different said different display time.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PETER-ANTHONY PAPPAS whose telephone number is 571-272-7646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM-5:30PM.

Art Unit: 2628

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka Chauhan can be reached on 571-272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Peter-Anthony Pappas/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2628